DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 822 HE 021 717

AUTHOR Balmores, Nestor R.
TITLE The Use of Field-Based Experience To Train Educational Leaders: An Historical Analysis.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Clinical Experience; Educational Research; Field Experience Programs; *Field Studies; Higher Education; Internship Programs; *On the Job Training; Professional Education; Research Methodology; Student Experience
IDENTIFIERS Field Observation Technique

ABSTRACT

The chronology of ideas and events that nurtured the development of field-based experience to train educational leaders is presented. The philosophical and intellectual foundations upon which field experience is based are identified. Field-based experience is a supervised on-the-job learning approach that is conducted in such ways as internships, externships, on-the-job training, and clinical experience. The formal use of field-based programs to train educational leaders, which began in 1933 at the University of Chicago, is widely used as an academic means of complementing classroom training. The early period from 1947 to 1959 is discussed, noting that the two events that triggered the wide acceptance of such programs were the organization of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration in 1947 and the role played by the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration in 1950. The second phase of development was the decade of the 1960s, in which universities and colleges seemed ready to fully integrate such programs. In the 1980s, the University Council for Educational Administration Center on Field Relations in Educational Administration Training Programs was established to review the status of field-based programs and describe activities. The value of field-based learning is now readily recognized. Lessons from the past suggest: the support of a professsional association is necessary to promote the development of field-based programs; the joint responsibility of a university and field agency is necessary; comprehensive planning is required; and research on on-going programs must continue. Contains 24 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298822

THE USE OF FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCE TO TRAIN EDUCATIONAL LEADERS: AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

by

NESTOR R. BALMORES
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
New Orleans, Louisiana
April, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nestor Balmores

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 717

THE USE OF FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCE TO TRAIN EDUCATIONAL LEADERS: AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Field-based experience is a supervised on-the-job learning approach that is conducted in various ways such as internship, externship, on-the-job training and clinical experience, among others. Newell (1952) identified its distinguishing feature when he said that it is "a phase of professional preparation in which a student who is nearing the completion of his formal study works in the field under the competent supervision of a practicing administrator and of a professional school representative for a considerable block of time for the purpose of developing competence in carrying administrative responsibilities."

The formal use of field-based programs to train educational leaders began in 1933 with the offering of an internship program at the University of Chicago. This was 52 years hence after William Harold Payne launched in 1881-1882 the first course designed to train principals and superintendents (Culbertson, 1988). Probably, a field-based experience system was not necessary during the formative years of educational administration since the courses that were offered then were "largely a summary of the concrete practical experiences of some former successful school superintendents who turned teachers in some newly established chair or department of education" (Cubberley, 1924).

Today, field-based experience is widely used as an academic technique to complement classroom training of future educational administrators prior to their formal entry into the profession.

The practicum is assumed to balance the theoretical knowledge in classroom instructions. This belief has been sustained by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) when the commission, in its 1987 report, reconfirmed the value of experiential learning as a key to a more effective preparation of school administrators (UCEA, 1987).

Field-based programs in educational administration, however, are not without problems. Daresh (1986), in a study that sought to determine the status of field-based training programs, found out that most field-based programs are not required of students except for certification purposes; that faculty members are not involved in a broad basis; and, that no university explicitly required the completion of a field experience for the purpose of completing academic degree requirements. These findings suggest that there are still reservations on the value of field-based learning programs. In fact, there were increased criticisms not only on the ways and means by which field-based programs are implemented but also in using field-based program as a strategy to blend theory and practice in the field of educational administration. In view of these developments, calls for reforms in field-based programs have intensified. Along this line, a historical analysis on the use of field-based experience to train educational leaders will definitely be an important input to whatever changes or reforms that will be introduced in field-based programs. This paper is an attempt to analyze historically the use of field-based learning in the area of educational

administration.

Specifically, the purpose of this paper is to trace the chronology of ideas and events that nurtured the institutionalization and development of field-based experience to train educational leaders. In so doing, this paper will identify the philosophical and intellectual foundations upon which field experience is based including the historical conditions which have led to its use over the years.

B. ITS EARLY GESTATION PERIOD: 1947-1959

Field-based experience in educational administration was borrowed from the medical field. Davies (1962) traced this development from medical students who studied in Europe in the latter part of the 19th century and imported the internship system into the United States.

The formal use of a field-based program in educational administration started at the University of Chicago when it offered its first internship program for school administrators in 1933. This was followed by the offering of an internship program in 1946 at the University of Omaha in Nebraska. In 1947 to 1948, five other universities, i.e., Teachers College, Columbia University, University of Georgia, University of Maryland, Western Maryland College and Michigan State College,began their internship programs.

Basically, the internship programs offered by the aforementioned universities were intended to provide administrative practica to students preparing for the positions

of elementary school principalship, secondary school principalship, assistant superintendency at the county and local levels and superintendency. These programs were offered at the master's level in the University of Georgia and the Western Maryland College and at the doctoral level in the Michigan State College and Teachers College, Columbia University. The University of Maryland offered its internship program either at the master's level or at the doctoral depending on students' needs and school situations. In 1950, these universities catered to an approximate number of 225 students (Wheaton, 1950).

Since then, the use of field-based experience program had gained national wide acceptance. 17 other institutions of higher learning started to offer internship programs for school administrators. Not all of these institutions, however, had allowed that credit toward a degree could be earned in an internship such as the case at Harvard University and at Michigan State College. The maximum credit allowed per semester or year in these programs ranged from three credit hours per semester (University of Omaha; Syracuse University) to no limit for resident students (University of Chicago). The combined efforts of these 17 institutions of higher learning trained an approximate number of 273 interns in school administration by the end of 1950 (Wheaton, 1950).

Davies (1962) identified two events in educational administration that triggered the wide acceptance of field-based programs to train educational leaders. These are the:

(1) organization of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) in 1947; and, (2) the role played by the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) in 1950.

1. The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA).

The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration was composed of institutions offering preparation programs for educational administrators on the graduate level and individuals whose interests lie in the improvement of educational leadership (Miller, 1951). The NCPEA performed the functions of bringing together researches in the field of educational administration, refining them for general use and synthesizing researches of related field for use in the area of educational administration (Miller, 1951).

In its first annual meeting at the I.B.M. Homestead, Endicott, New York in 1947, the NCPEA decided to include "internship" as one of the major topics. The sessions on internship aroused the interest of the participants. The participants wanted for more information on the nature of internship, its advantages and disadvantages and possible strategies of organizing internship programs (Davies, 1962).

In its fourth annual meeting in Ithaca, New York in 1950, the following philosophical foundations and operational requirements of an internship program were discussed:

a. An internship program is an effective strategy to blend

theory and practice in educational administration. This assumption emphasizes the importance of providing student administrators with theoretical knowledge in educational administration and actual administrative experiences in school management. This recognizes the fact that a school administrator's job cannot be mastered without actual hands-on experiences.

b. The purpose of an internship program is to produce educational leaders. This underscores the need to define the necessary experiences required from an educational leader which would become the bases for setting-up an internship program. This connotes that an internship program is future-oriented. It is not offered just to satisfy an institutional requirement but must be used as a strategy to create a pool of educational leaders.

c. An internship program requires the cooperation of three "actors", i.e., the intern, the university and the cooperating field agency. Miller (1952) even suggested that a contractual agreement should exist between the university, the cooperating agency and the intern. Unless an open system of communication exists between and among the three "actors", the required cooperation is difficult to realize.

The efforts of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration to institutionalize internship programs were funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The

educational administration community viewed the support of the Kellogg Foundation as a key factor in the development of field-based programs particularly in stimulating organized efforts in the area of professional training in educational administration throughout the country. Operational support was also extended by organizations such as the American Association of School Administrators, the National Council of Chief State Officers, and the National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents (Miller, 1951).

2. The Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA).

Concretized from a proposal during the 1946 Planning Committee of the American Association of School Administrators, the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) was organized in 1950. It focused its attention on the professionalization of school administration along the lines of preservice preparation programs, inservice training activities and research (CPEA, 1954).

In the CPEA at the Middle Atlantic Region which operated in the tier of the eastern states extending from New York to North Carolina, special emphasis was placed on the experimentation and development of internship in educational administration. Eight universities, i.e., University of Buffalo, Duke University, University of Maryland, New York University, Syracuse University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Pittsburgh and the Teachers College, Columbia University, participated in this

endeavor and had sponsored an approximate number of 140 interns in 120 different field agencies (Hooker, 1958). The objectives of these internship programs were:

(a) to develop among the interns a more comprehensive view of educational administration;

(b) to provide the interns with experience of carrying real administrative responsibility;

(c) to provide opportunity for administrator and field agency to fulfill their professional obligation of sharing in the preparation of prospective administrators;

(d) to test training programs of university against reality in the field and thus improve preparatory program for prospective administrators; and

(e) to stimulate interaction of university and school district.

In 1951, the First Middle Atlantic States Work Conference on Internships in Educational Administration was conducted. Participants from different universities requested assistance from the Conference on how to solve problems confronting internship programs in their respective campuses. Thus, the executive-committee of the CPEA-MAR commissioned Professor Clarence A. Newell of the University of Maryland in January, 1952 to prepare a manual on how to establish and conduct internship programs in educational administration (Davies, 1962). This manual entitled Handbook for the Development of Internship

Programs in Educational Administration became available in May, 1952. In this handbook, Newell (1952) presented a broad overview of the history of intern programs for the preparation of school administrators, stated the assumptions, rationale and values inherent in the internship approach and pursued major issues such as candidate recruitment, selection and placement, supervision in the field, relationships between field and university supervisors, and the ways of evaluating interns.

In November, 1952, a group of scholars in the field of education joined and discussed "Internships in School Administration" in a portfolio in The Nation's Schools. These scholars were: (1) Clarence A. Newell, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Maryland; (2) William A. Yeager, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Pittsburgh; (3) Walter A. Anderson, Professor and Chairman, Department of Administration and Supervision, New York University; (4) E.C. Bolmeier, Professor of Education, Duke University, Durnham, North Carolina; (5) Burvil H. Glenn, Professor of Education, University of Buffalo, New York; (6) O.H. Aurand, Professor of Education, Pennsylvania State College; (7) E. Edmund Reutter, Jr., Assistant Professor of Education and Coordinator of the Internship Program, Teachers College, Columbia University; (8) Gordon A. Wheaton, Supervising Principal, Monroe-Woodbury Central Schools, Orange County, Monroe, New York; (9) Harvey W. Kreuzberg, Principal, Sparks High School, Baltimore County, Maryland; and, (10) Ernest O. Melby, Dean, School of

Education, New York University (Davies, 1962). Their involvement sparked further the growth of internship in the United States. From there on, the ranks of scholars who got interested on the area of internship increased rapidly. Research on the area began to flourish.

In the January, 1953 issue of the Teachers College Record, Professor B.J. Chandler of the University of Virginia and Professor Daniel R. Davies of Teachers College came up with an analytical paper on the professor internship. Brochures on internship programs began to appear in major universities such as the nine-paged description of internship at Ohio State University and a sixteen-page brochure entitled "Suggested Policies and Procedures for the Internship in Educational Administration" at Harvard University. Professor Clarence A. Newell continued to write on the subject such as his "Administrative Interns Meet Reality" (Newell, 1950), "What is Internship?" (Newell, 1951) and "Planning Internships for Prospective School Administrators," (Newell, 1951) among others.

In 1958, the CPEA Center at Teachers College published its first assessment on the internship program which began in 1950. Entitled "An Appraisal of the Internship in Educational Administration," it reported an in-depth study of the results of the experimentation on internship by the eight universities in the Middle Atlantic Region. The following findings, inter-alia, (Hooker, 1958) proved to be valuable to ignore:

(a) An internship of less than one year full time does not

permit interns to have experiences in many areas of administration. Short internships seldom approximate real administrative experiences.

Hooker (1958) recommended that internships in educational administration should extend over at least a full school year, in order that a wide variety of experiences may come within the realm of the intern. Hooker (1958) further suggested that internships in educational administration should involve full time daily activities. These suggestions would follow the internship model designed for resident interns in the medical field.

(b) School boards and school administrators must extend their utmost cooperation and willingness to sponsor interns. Unless school administrators would recognize the value of field-based programs, universities are helpless in their efforts to maintain a field-based program.

(c) The awarding of graduate credit for the internship in educational administration by universities contributes toward the acceptance of the program by graduate students. This allowed staff time for the supervision of the program. There must be cooperative planning of the internship program by the academic staff of a department of educational administration. Coordination of the internship program should be delegated to a staff member

with authority to make the provisions necessary for its success.

(d) Evaluation should be continuous and cooperative, involving the intern, the sponsoring administrator, and the coordinator of the program for the entire duration of the internship. Hooker (1958) pointed out the need for improved evaluation procedures.

B. UNDER THE UCEA YEARS: 1960 TO PRESENT

The decade of the 1960s may be regarded as the second phase in the growth and development of field-based programs as strategies to train educational leaders. After a decade of exploration and experimentation, universities and colleges offering educational administration programs seemed to be ready to fully integrate a field-based experience program in administrators' preparation program. Along the aforementioned lines, the internship program at Teachers College, Columbia University, under the leadership of Dr. Howard B. Funk, became a permanent feature of its curricular offerings in educational administration (Davies, 1959).

Generally speaking, two types of field-based programs were offered at the Teachers College. These were: (1) the apprenticeship, wherein the system nominates the trainee from its staff and provides the on-the-job training in conjunction with an academic program leading toward certification and the doctorate and professional counselling provided by the College; and (2) formal internship, wherein the agency concerned selects the

intern from a recommended list of certified doctoral candidates that would be provided by the College (Davies, 1959).

Complementing this development at Columbia University, the establishment of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), an organization which aimed at upgrading educational administration and composed by leading universities throughout the country, provided the field-based programs with some degree of permanence. In all of its annual conferences, the use of field-based experience was always a topic that would interest participants. Moreover, the designation of The Ohio State University as the first site for the UCEA headquarters became a plus factor towards enhancing the growth of internship programs. Ohio State University had demonstrated over the years a strong commitment to the field-based experience approach.

Other organizations particularly the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) complemented the UCEA efforts. In 1962, the NASSP sought support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education for an administrative pilot project in the areas of internship and leadership. Initially funded for a sum of $330,000, a two-year pilot project began in 1963. During the second year, the project was expanded so that by June, 1965, 35 interns had worked in 47 junior and senior high schools under the supervision of 24 universities (Trump, 1967). Meanwhile, 117 universities were already offering internship programs to graduate students (Doob, 1974).

The NASSP project was phased out in 1969. Other

universities, however, picked up the pieces and started their own internship programs. Worthy to mention are the administrative internship program at the University of Wisconsin which was expanded to include internship in higher education, vocational technical schools, elementary and secondary schools, central office and educational association (Moser, 1969) and the Program for Educational Leadership (PEL) at Teachers College, Columbia University, which started in September, 1968, with an institutional assistance grant from the United States Office of Education (Cresswell and Goettel, 1970). Institutions other than universities, public school systems or state departments of education also supported planned internships. An example of this type would be the Washington Internship in Education (WIE).

With the continuous growth of field-based programs as institutional strategies to train educational leaders, problems also became evident. The 1969 national UCEA study by Jack Culbertson showed that field experience programs lacked diversity and were not completely consistent with other aspects of the preparation program as seen by university educational administration faculty members and school administrators (West and West, 1977). The lack of diversity among internship programs became a barrier for interns to have as much experience as they could in many areas in administration. Further, serious doubts were cast on the capability of a field-based experience program to blend theory and practice since the internship programs were not even consistent with the administrators' preparation program.

Olson (1970) also reported that financial problems had been plaguing internship programs prompting some UCEA institutions to abolish internship programs. Hoesktra (1975) attributed this downward trend to the inability of internship programs to anticipate the demands of an increasingly dynamic and complex society. Apparently, field-based programs did not improve much despite the investment of money and efforts by educational institutions and allied educational agencies including foundations like the Ford and Kellogg.

Despite these disturbing developments, the UCEA continued to support efforts of institutions in the area of field-based experience programs. In July, 1984, the UCEA executive committee established the UCEA Center on Field Relations in Educational Administration Training Programs, co-hosted by The Ohio State University and the University of Cincinnati. Its objectives are:

(1) To review the status of field-based administrative preparation programs and to disseminate information collected concerning these programs to those interested in the preservice training of educational administrators;

(2) To determine the nature of existing linkage relationships involving UCEA and local, state and national education agencies for the purpose of research and development activities; and

(3) To describe the variety of activities currently being utilized in UCEA departments of educational

administration and to implement outreach programs.

In 1984-1985, James LaPlant of the University of Cincinnati and John Daresh of The Ohio State University, who later on were designated co-directors of the Center, conducted an assessment of the status of field-based programs in the United States. Daresh and LaPlant (1985) reported their findings:

(1) Field-based training components do not appear to be viewed as integral parts of academic programs. Field relations programs are described as activities designed primarily to meet the mandates and standards of some agency external to the university;

(2) A single faculty member, in most cases, is given the responsibility of coordinating and directing the field-based activities. In several institutions, the person responsible for supervising internships and planned field-experiences was an adjunct or clinical instructor. The majority of academic program faculty is not involved with supervising practica;

(3) Field-based activities appear to be largely "add-on" features to academic programs. The ways in which linkages between theory and practice are rarely specified; and

(4) Respondents indicated a belief that the programs are less satisfactory in many respects.

The Daresh-LaPlant 1984-1985 assessment was 27 years after the Hooker's 1958 appraisal of the internship in educational

administration. It is sad to note that the problems that beset field-based programs in 1958 persisted to plague the programs until the 1980s. For instance, field-based learning was not yet an integral part of the educational administration program. As a strategy, there were serious doubts on its capability to blend theory and practice. Organizationally, the required collaboration between and among the "actors" involved in a field-based program was not as effective as it should be. In the process, a field-based learning in educational administration would pale in comparison with other field-based programs such as in the fields of medicine and law. Daresh (1987) suggested an examination of the commitment of universities to this approach, and, if necessarily, to reconceptualize existing field-based programs.

C. SOME CONCLUDING NOTES: LESSONS FROM THE PAST

Despite the problems that confront field-based programs, the value of field-based learning is recognized readily. Practica are important aspects of educational administration as an applied field of study. As stated earlier, the school administrator's job cannot be mastered without actual hands-on experience.

However, as a learning strategy, a field-based program has its "nuances" that do not characterize a typical academic classroom course. First, a field-based program attempts to blend theory and practice. This, by itself, is a tall order. Discrepancies always exist between the "world of theory" and the "world of practice." It is even possible that theories would outrun administrative practices by a number of years; thus,

student administrators may become frustrated with an administrative environment that is considered "obsolete" and may, in the process, affect adversely the visionary trait of prospective administrators. Second, a field-based program involves the active participation of a university, through its department of educational administration, and a field agency. Two different agencies, albeit allied, are therefore involved in overseeing a field-based program. This relationship may create organizational and managerial conflicts if responsibilities and scope of authority of both agencies are not clearly stated and understood by the participants in a field-based program. And third, a field-based program is a complete program by itself. In managing, therefore, a field-based program, the rudiment of program management, i.e., comprehensive planning, including feasibility studies, and monitoring and evaluation, among others, are to be observed to manage it successfully.

Given the aforementioned characteristics of a field-based program as well as its history as presented in this paper, the following lessons from the past may be considered as valuable inputs to any prospective reforms in the area of field-based programs in educational administration:

(1) The support of a professional association is necessary to promote the development of field-based programs. This was shown by the examples of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) and the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration

(Middle Atlantic Region) in the 1950s and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) from the 1960s to the present. These professional associations provided the necessary structure for the institutionalization of field-based programs as well as providing the environment for research on the area of field-based experience.

There are indications, however, that support coming from professional associations must be broadened to include support from professional associations of practitioners. This is as critical as the involvement of professional associations of academicians. Through the participation of professional associations of practitioners, the structure for an increased and active involvement of field agencies in field-based programs of universities may become more certain.

(2) The joint responsibility of a university and a field agency is necessary in the successful implementation of a field-based program. The history of field-based programs shows that this condition has always been harped by experts in educational administration. But this has always persisted as a problem. Probably, the issue of who controls the field-based program is an unclear aspect of the organizational arrangement. The practice of academic coordinators of field-based programs to involve minimally the field agencies through

arranged visitations and/or observations will not work. Take note that a student administrator in a field-based program works on real school problems under the joint guidance of a learned theorist and an able practitioner. And the locus of learning has been transferred from a university classroom to a field agency. Thus, the responsibility rests on both the academic professor and the administrative supervisor.

(3) Comprehensive planning is needed to establish or to re-structure a field-based program. This requires the active participation of all parties involved, including the intern, in order to formulate the goals and objectives of a field-based program, its organizational and managerial requirements, the authority and responsibilities of concerned parties and an effective system of evaluation. In this manner, a field-based program is viewed as a complete organizational program by itself. It is, therefore, necessary to review the current strategy of offering a field-based program as a course in educational administration.

(4) Research on on-going field-based programs must continue. Research on this area must not only be limited to determining the effectiveness of on-going field-based program but should also include the conceptualization of field-based experience as a learning strategy.The active involvement of leading scholars in the field of

educational administration will provide the research impetus in the area of field-based experience.

The aforementioned are not by all means exhaustive. Definitely, there are more lessons that could be drawn from the history of the use of field-based programs in training educational leaders. These lessons from the past are valuable inputs to consider in structuring the future of field-based programs in educational administration.

REFERENCES

CPEA, 3 Years of Progress in the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. Washington 6, D.C.: The American Association of School Administration, 1954.

Cresswell, Anthony M. and Robert J. Goettel, "Rotating Internship and Situational Analyses," UCEA Newsletter, February, 1970.

Cubberley, Ellwood, "Public School Administration," in I.L. Kandel, Twenty-Five Years of American Education. New York, 1924.

Culbertson, Jack, "A Century's Quest for a Knowledge Base," in Boyan, Norman, Handbook of Research in Educational Administration: A Project of the American Educational Research Association. New York: Longham, 1988.

Daresh, John C., "Field-Based Educational Administration Training Programs," Planning and Change, 17 (2), Summer, 1986.

Daresh, John C. and James C. LaPlant, "Field Relations in Educational Administration Training Programs," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, October, 1985.

Daresh, John C., "The Highest Hurdles for the First Year Principal," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.: April, 1987.

Daresh, John, "Administrative Internships and Field Experiences: A Status Report," UCEA Review, 1987.

Davies, Daniel R., The Internship in Educational Administration. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962.

Davies, Daniel R., A Report of a Project Entitled: Teachers College Looks to the Future of Educational Administration. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Doob, Heather S., ERS Report: Internship Programs in Educational Administration. Educational Research Service Inc., 1974.

Hocker, Clifford P., ed., An Appraisal of the Internship in Educational Administration. Teachers College, Columbia University: Bureau of Publications, 1958.

Moser, Robert D., "The Administrative Internship Comes of Age." 1969.

Miller, Van, Providing and Improving Administrative Leadership for America's Schools: The Fourth Report of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, 1951.

Newell, Clarence A. and R. F.Will, "Administrative Interns Meet Reality," School Executive, 70, 1980.

Newell, Clarence A., Handbook for the Development of Internship Programs in Educational Administration. New York: Cooperative Program in Educational Administration- Middle Atlantic Region, Teachers College, Columbia University. May, 1952.

Newell, Clarence A. and R.F. Will, "Planning Internship for Prospective School Administrators," Educational Administration and Supervision. 37, 1951.

Newell, Clarence, "What is Internship?" School and Society. 74, 1981.

Olson, Leroy C., "The Status and Future of the Administrative Internship in the United States," (unpublished doctoral dissertation) Temple University, 1970.

Silver, P. and D.W. Spuch, eds., Preparatory Programs for Educational Administration in the United States. Columbus: UCEA, 1978.

Trump, J. Lloyed, The First 55. National Association of Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: 1967.

University Council for Educational Administration, Leaders for America's Schools: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. 1987

West, Joan E. and Philip T. West, "The Administrative Internship in Education: Token or Triumph? Catalyst for Change. 7, 1977.

Wheaton, Gordon, A Status Study of Internship Programs in School Administration: A Report of a Type C Project. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.